



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/734,792

12/12/2003

Erwin Hacker

514413-3869.1

3467

20999 7590 09/07/2007  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG  
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/07/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/734,792	Applicant(s) HACKER ET AL.	
	Examiner Sabiha Qazi	Art Unit 1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3,6-9 and 12-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,6-9 and 12-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1616

Final Office Action

Claims 3, 6, 7-9, 12-21 are pending. No claim is allowed at this time. Amendments are entered.

Summary of this Office Action Firday, August 31, 2007

1. Information Disclosure Statement
2. Copending Applications
3. Specification
4. 35 USC § 112 --- First Paragraph Written Description Rejection
5. 35 USC § 103—Rejection
6. Response to Remarks
7. Conclusion
8. Communication

Art Unit: 1616

Election of Species--- (Examiner Mark Clardy). New election of species is not accepted.

The response filed July 25, 2002, applicants elected the composition comprising the following herbicides:

A2.

N-(1-cyclopropyl-4-phenylbutyl)-6-(1-fluoro-1-methylethyl)-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine

B1.3.3

Fenoxaprop.

This election will be maintained herein.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

#### Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other

Art Unit: 1616

copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See *Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc.*, 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

### Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

### 35 USC § 112 --- First Paragraph Written Description Rejection

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 3, 6, 7-9, 12-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in

Art Unit: 1616

the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The data presented in the specification examples 1-22 (pages 68 to 86) are not considered synergistic. Furthermore, synergism cannot be predicted for all the combination as claimed. In the present case sulfonyl urea compounds of formula I include large number of compounds which are combined with (B) which also includes hundreds of compounds as listed in claims such as in claims 19, 14, 15. It is not possible to predict the synergistic combinations for Markush group of combinations.

Applicant has no possession of the invention of the subject matter as claimed at the time of filing the application. Applicant is kindly requested to explain the issue.

Applicant is kindly requested to explain this issue.

The written description requirement prevents applications from using the amendment process to update the disclosure in their disclosures (claims or specification) during the pendency before the patent office. Otherwise applicants could add new matter to their disclosures and date them back to their original filing date, thus defeating an accurate accounting of the priority of the invention. See 35 USC 132. The function of description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of filing date of the application relied on, the specific subject matter claimed by him.

Art Unit: 1616

See *Genetech*, 108 F 3d 1361, 1365 (Fed. Cir. at 1366, 78, 1999).

The test for determining compliance with the written description requirement is y  
conveys to one skilled in the art that the inventor had the possession at the time of the later  
claimed subject matter, rather than the presence or absence of literal support in the  
specification for the claimed language. See *In re Kaslow*, 707 F 2d 1366, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

See MPEP 2163.06 (for applicant convenience relevant portions are as follows).

#### GENERAL PRINCIPLES GOVERNING COMPLIANCE WITH THE "WRITTEN DESCRIPTION" REQUIREMENT FOR APPLICATIONS

The first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 requires that the "specification shall contain a written description of the invention \* \* \*." This requirement is separate and distinct from the enablement requirement. See, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1560, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1114 (Fed. Cir. 1991). >See also *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 358 F.3d 916, 920-23, 69 USPQ2d 1886, 1890-93 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (discussing history and purpose of the written description requirement); *In re Curtis*, 354 F.3d 1347, 1357, 69 USPQ2d 1274, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("conclusive evidence of a claim's enablement is not equally conclusive of that claim's satisfactory written description").< The written description requirement has several policy objectives. "[T]he 'essential goal' of

Art Unit: 1616

the description of the invention requirement is to clearly convey the information that an applicant has invented the subject matter which is claimed." *In re Barker*, 559 F.2d 588, 592 n.4, 194 USPQ 470, 473 n.4 (CCPA 1977). Another objective is to put the public in possession of what the applicant claims as the invention. See *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1566, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1089 (1998). The written description requirement of the Patent Act promotes the progress of the useful arts by ensuring that patentees adequately describe their inventions in their patent specifications in exchange for the right to exclude others from practicing the invention for the duration of the patent's term.

To satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc.*, 325 F.3d 1306, 1319, 66 USPQ2d 1429, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116. However, a showing of possession alone does not cure the lack of a written description. *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.*, 323 F.3d 956, 969-70, 63 USPQ2d 1609, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Much of the written description case law addresses whether the specification as originally filed supports claims not originally in the application.



Art Unit: 1616

An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Possession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing that the invention was "ready for patenting" such as by the disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Pfaff v. Wells Elecs., Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55, 68, 119 S.Ct. 304, 312, 48 USPQ2d 1641, 1647 (1998); *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406; *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1206, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1021 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (one must define a compound by "whatever characteristics sufficiently distinguish it"). "Compliance with the written description requirement is essentially a fact-based inquiry that will 'necessarily vary depending on the nature of the invention claimed.'" *Enzo Biochem*, \*\*>323 F.3d at 963<, 63 USPQ2d at 1613.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

*This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).*

Claims 3, 6, 7-9, 12-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GIENCKE et al. (US Patent 6,239,071), HOECHST (PCT 98/34925), HIRATA et al. (A: EP 0

Art Unit: 1616

467 204; B: 0 469 406; D: C: 0 47 221; EP 0 471 284), TAKEMATSU (abstract of JPO Publication 04095003, IDEMITSU (A: Abstract of JP 7267804; B: abstract of JP 7267805) and applicants disclosure (page 27).

It is noted that applicants have stated on the record that the aminotriazinyl herbicides herein are known and that they have been described in the prior art (specification, p. 27).

Giencke et al teach that aminotriazine herbicides may be combined with a large number of secondary herbicides (columns 18-20).

Hoechst teaches also that aminotriazine herbicides may be combined with various other herbicides (p. 36-38).

Hirata et al (A) teach the synergistic combination of aminotriazine herbicides with urea herbicides.

Hirata et al (B) teach the synergistic combination of aminotriazine herbicides with benzoic acid or pyridine carboxylic acid herbicides.

Hirata et al (C) teach the synergistic combination of aminotriazine herbicides with thiocarbamate herbicides (formula II).

Hirata et al (D) teach the synergistic combination of aminotriazine herbicides with sulfonylurea herbicides.

Takematsu teaches the combination of aminotriazine herbicides with dinitroaniline herbicides for selective weed control.

Idemitsu (A) teaches the synergistic combination of aminotriazine herbicides with prodiamine, dithiopyr, halosulfuron, triclopyr, napropamid, bensulide, propyzamide,

Art Unit: 1616

flazasulfuron, imazosulfuron, and imazaquin.

Idemitsu (B) teaches the synergistic combination of aminotriazine herbicides with pyrazosulfuron-ethyl, MCPP, pendimethalin, besulodine, and simazine.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of these references because they teach the herbicidal utility of aminotriazine compounds in combination with a variety of secondary herbicides.

Thus it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined applicants' aminotriazine herbicides with a second herbicidal agent, to make a synergistic herbicidal composition because a wide variety of such combinations has been shown by the cited prior art to result in synergistic compositions. Further, it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition that is to be used for the very same purpose; the idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art. In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069. Determination of appropriate concentration ranges would have been within the skill level of the ordinary artisan.

Merely amending the claims to "proviso out" the specific combinations discussed in the cited prior art does not negate the teaching that it was known to combine the subject herbicidal compounds with any known herbicide. Further, in view of the teachings concerning synergy, it would appear that merely demonstrating synergistic results, as

Art Unit: 1616

taught in the prior art, would be insufficient for overcoming the rejection.

As has been decided by the court, a combination, for the same purpose, of one additive explicitly disclosed in the prior art and another suggested by the prior art is at least prima facie obvious. In re Susi, 169 USPQ 423. There is nothing inventive in a composition of old ingredients of known properties with each ingredient functioning individually as expected. In re Sussaman 58 USPQ 262.

Furthermore, because of each compound appears to be well known in the prior art, it would appear that the combination of the compounds would have been obvious in view of MPEP 2144.06 and see Ex parte Quadranti, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992).

In Ex parte Quadranti where it was held that

“ Use of materials in combination, each of which is known to function for intended purpose, is generally held to be prima facie obvious, and in instant case, use of combination of herbicides is so notoriously well known as to be capable of being taken by official notice; generalizations such as Colby formula are not particularly useful in determining whether synergism has been demonstrated, since formula inherently results in expectation of less than additive effect for combination of herbicides, since there is no evidence that such approach is considered valid by significant number of ordinarily skilled workers in relevant area of technology, and since it could be reasonably argued that in most cases, additive or better than additive results could be expected for combination of herbicides.”

" There is no single, appropriate test for determining whether synergism has been demonstrated for chemical combination; rather, facts shown in each case must be analyzed to determine whether chosen method has clearly and convincingly demonstrated existence of synergism or unobvious result"

" Assuming arguendo that the differences in values presented are statistically significant, there is no evidence that they represent a true, practical advantage. In re Freeman, 474 F.2d 1318, 177 USPQ 139 (CCPA 1973); In re Klosak , 455 F.2d 1077, 173 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1972); In re D'Ancicco, 439 F.2d 1244, 169 USPQ 303 (CCPA 1971). Also, prescinding from the Colby formula test, which as we have already indicated is at best controversial and in our view probably invalid, there is no evidence that the differences are unexpected. In re Merck, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed.Cir. 1986); In re Longi , 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed.Cir. 1985); In re Freeman, supra"

#### Data in the Specification

The data presented in the specification examples 1-22 (pages 68 to 86) are not considered synergistic. Furthermore, synergism cannot be predicted for all the combination as claimed. In the present case sulfonyl urea compounds of formula I include large number of compounds which are combined with (B) which also includes hundreds of compounds as listed in claims such as in claims 19, 14, 15. Therefore, results presented in the specification are not considered synergistic and do not represent the combination of whole genus as claimed.

Art Unit: 1616

As has been established that a single species is seldom, if ever, sufficient to support a generic claim. In re Shokal, 242 F.2d 771, 113 U.S.P.Q. 283, 285 (C.C.P.A. 1957). See also, In re Grimme, 274 F.2d 949, 124 U.S.P.Q. 499, 501 (C.C.P.A. 1960) (the naming of a member of a genus or subgenus is not a proper basis for claiming the whole group).

Objective evidence of nonobviousness must be commensurate in scope with the scope of the claims. In re Tiffin, 171 USPQ 294. A showing limited to a single species can hardly be considered probative of the invention's nonobviousness in view of the breadth of the claims.

Because each of the herbicides are well-known in the prior art, it would appear that the combination as claimed would have been obvious in view of MPEP 2144.06 and particularly in view of *Ex parte Quadranti*, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992) where it was held that " the use of combinations of herbicides is so notoriously well known as to be capable of being taken together by the official notice."

Since the results shown in the specification are not synergistic instant invention is considered obvious over the prior art of record.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1616

Response to Remarks

Rejection under 112 (1) scope of enablement rejection is withdrawn because arguments are found persuasive.

All other rejections are maintained because arguments are not found persuasive. Rejection under 103 written by Examiner Clardy is maintained for the same reasons as set forth in the previous office action. Each compound appears to be well known in the prior art, it would appear that the combination of the compounds would have been obvious in view of MPEP 2144.06 and see Ex parte Quadranti, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992).

In Ex parte Quadranti where it was held that

“ Use of materials in combination, each of which is known to function for intended purpose, is generally held to be prima facie obvious, and in instant case, use of combination of herbicides is so notoriously well known as to be capable of being taken by official notice; generalizations such as Colby formula are not particularly useful in determining whether synergism has been demonstrated, since formula inherently results in expectation of less than additive effect for combination of herbicides, since there is no evidence that such approach is considered valid by significant number of ordinarily skilled workers in relevant area of technology, and since it could be reasonably argued that in most cases, additive or better than additive results could be expected for combination of herbicides.”



Art Unit: 1616

" There is no single, appropriate test for determining whether synergism has been demonstrated for chemical combination; rather, facts shown in each case must be analyzed to determine whether chosen method has clearly and convincingly demonstrated existence of synergism or unobvious result"

" Assuming arguendo that the differences in values presented are statistically significant, there is no evidence that they represent a true, practical advantage. In re Freeman, 474 F.2d 1318, 177 USPQ 139 (CCPA 1973); In re Klosak , 455 F.2d 1077, 173 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1972); In re D'Ancicco, 439 F.2d 1244, 169 USPQ 303 (CCPA 1971). Also, prescinding from the Colby formula test, which as we have already indicated is at best controversial and in our view probably invalid, there is no evidence that the differences are unexpected. In re Merck, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed.Cir. 1986); In re Longi , 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed.Cir. 1985); In re Freeman, supra"

### *Conclusion*

1. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1616

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

#### Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, Johann Richter, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
SABIHA QAZI, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER